

I. CLAIM OBJECTIONS.

Claims 30, 38, and 39 have been cancelled. Claim 26 has been amended to differentiate it from claim 15. Because claims 31 and 32 are dependent from claim 26 applicant submits that these changes have eliminated the duplication objections that the Examiner rightfully noted.

II. CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the present application and respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 15-18, 26-32, 36 and 39. As discussed below, the applicant has amended claims 15, 19, and 26 in order to more distinctly claim my invention and to make clear that microwave action alone is sufficient to bind the glass and the plastic together and also to make claim 19 distinct from claim 26. Also, in amending claims 15, 19, and 26 to include reference to the formed glass and plastic shapes remaining substantially unchanged, I have tried to adopt the Examiner's suggested claim language.

In addition, I have added dependent claims 40-44 to try to make clear that, unlike *Kohan*, the present invention does not use an adhesive cured by microwave radiation to bond the plastic and glass together. Rather, in the present invention, the plastic and glass are already bonded together from the action of the microwave radiation. The microwave radiation is applied only to further enhance the strength of the peripheral sealant. Applicant submits that these changes have eliminated all the 35 U.S.C. §112 reasons for rejection that the Examiner noted.

III. CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

"Under 35 U.S.C. §102, anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be disclosed in a prior art reference." "Every element of the claimed invention must be literally present."

The present invention discloses using microwave radiation to bond microwave-absorbing glass to various forms of plastic. Further, the present invention uses a sealant applied to the margin of the composite optical material. Because this margin is exposed to air, the present invention includes using air-cured sealants. Thus, some of the sealants capable of being used with the present invention would fully cure regardless of whether they were exposed to microwave radiation or not.

Because *Kohan* (U.S. Patent 5,851,328; Column 14, lines 19-21) teaches using radiation to cure a central adhesive and the present invention uses microwave radiation to enhance a peripheral seal on an already bonded composite, the present invention is not anticipated by *Kohan*. Further, the use of a sealant only on the composite material's margin makes, as the Examiner points out, the present invention structurally distinct from *Kohan*.

Another benefit of the present invention is that, when the plastic is annealed on to the potentially perfectly spherical glass surface by microwave generated heat, the peripheral distortions inherent in compression-molded plastics, such as polycarbonates, are reduced. *Kohan*

lacks this distortion reducing element and thus the present invention is not anticipated by *Kohan*.

IV. CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. §103

The present invention teaches a non-deforming, no-adhesive-centrally method for bonding glass and plastic together. *Kohan* (US 5851328; Abstract; line 5) teaches the use of adhesives and pressure to deform the shape of the final optical composite. Thus, *Kohan* teaches away from the present invention method of non-deformingly bonding glass and plastic to one another.

As an aside, I should point out that I am fully aware of the refractive power advantages inherent in a composite ophthalmic lens, even when simply bonding two pieces of the same material together, as explained by *Kohan*. It has been a dream of the ophthalmic industry for decades.

Each of the Examiner's objections and rejections has been addressed. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of this application, the applicant would welcome a collect telephone call at the Examiner's convenience to the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Gordon W. Dyer

Gordon W. Dyer
Registration No. 46,677
19269 Babler Forest Rd.
Chesterfield, MO 63005
(636) 273-5738